

### REMARKS

In the office action, claims 1 and 3-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferchichi et al. in view of Gupta et al. and in further view of Kawasaki, and claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferchichi et al. in view of Gupta et al. and Kawasaki and in further view of Wu.

Applicant amends claim 1, and adds new claims 19 and 20. The subject matter of the amendment is taught in the second paragraph of the Detailed Description Of The Embodiments” in the instant specification.

In the Response to Arguments in the detailed action, the examiner replies to applicant’s arguments on page 9 of REMARKS, “There is neither any authentication of sign-on module (ICP) in accessing the smart card, nor any stored ICP authentication information in Ferchichi” filed on 1/20/2009, with a statement that **the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., smart card) are not recited in the rejected claims.** Applicant respectfully contends that the examiner’s statement has not answered the issue raised by applicant’s arguments **which do not mean or require claims 1 and 10 to rely upon the smart card.**

In fact, the key issue that applicant raised on page 9 of REMARKS is whether Ferchichi teaches the limitations that **“user’s login identification information is stored in the user-login-identification means”** and **“ICP access authentication information is stored in the user-login-identification means”** recited in claims 1 and 10. Please note that claims 1 and 10 require that both **user’s login identification information** and **ICP**

access authentication information be stored in the user-login-identification means.

However, examiner **has used the SMART CARD of Ferchichi to reject claims 1 and 10 in the final office action dated 10/21/2008, and the instant office action dated 3/12/2009** by considering Ferchichi's SMART CARD as equivalent to the user-login-identification means although Ferchichi's SMART CARD has not met the limitations recited in claims 1 and 10. Therefore, applicant made the argument on page 9 of REMARKS dated 1/20/2009 to point out that **the SMART CARD of Ferchichi does not store ICP access authentication information**, and can not be equivalent to the user-login-identification means of claims 1 and 10.

In both office actions (10/21/2008 and 3/12/2009), the examiner cites page 6, lines 24-26 and page 12, lines 15-16 of Ferchichi as having disclosed "user's login identification information is stored in the user-login-identification means". Applicant agrees with this citation because the statement "*the smart-card 17 is activated (arrow 15) in order to retrieve the login information (arrow 16)*" of page 12, lines 15-16 can be interpreted as Ferchichi having stored user's login identification information in the SMART CARD. However, the examiner further cites page 6, lines 19-26 as having disclosed "ICP access authentication information is stored in the user-login-identification means". Applicant respectfully contends that the citation is groundless. Applicant hereby excerpts page 6, lines 19-26:

*"The login name and the secrets entered are then checked in the single sign-on module 13 and compared with names and secrets stored in a protected memory area of the module 13 (not shown) to verify the user's authorization. If the test fails, the user may*

*be requested to try again, until a predefined maximal number of tries has been reached. Otherwise, the smart-card 17 is activated (arrow 15) in order to retrieve the login information (arrow 16) needed for successively completing the communication layers 22-27 (arrows 18-21)."*

Applicant respectfully points out that the above excerpted paragraph only refers to the *login name and the secrets* of the user to verify the user's authorization. The examiner considers the sign-on module of Ferchichi as equivalent to the ICP (Internet Content Provider) of the instant invention. However, throughout the whole disclosure of Ferchichi including the above excerpted paragraph, the login authentication in Ferchichi is only made to verify the user's authorization. **There has never been any authentication made to authenticate the sign-on module (ICP).** In other words, **the single sign-on module of Ferchichi never undergoes any authentication** but **the ICP of the instant invention has to be authenticated** for accessing the user-login-identification means as recited in claims 1 and 10.

It is important also to note that in page 6, lines 19-26, it clearly states *names and secrets stored in a protected memory area of the module 13, and the smart-card 17 is activated (arrow 15) in order to retrieve the login information (arrow 16)*. No matter how the paragraph is interpreted, the information "names and secrets of user" is stored in a protected memory area of the module 13, and the "login information" is stored in the smart-card 17. The module 13 and smart-card 17 are **two separate and different physical modules** as disclosed in Ferchichi. In contrast, claims 1 and 10 require that both **user's login identification information** and **ICP access authentication information** be

stored in **the user-login-identification means rather than two different physical modules.**

If examiner insists on the rejections of claims 1 and 10, applicant respectfully requests the examiner to specifically identify where and which cited prior arts have taught, disclosed or suggested storing both **user's login identification information** and **ICP access authentication information** in a **user-login-identification means** for respectively authenticating the user in logging into the ICP's web pages and authenticating the ICP in accessing the user-login-identification means.

In response to the instant office action, applicant would like to argue that, in addition to the physical difference discussed above, claims 1 and 10 of the present application are based on novel and non-obvious technical features over Ferchichi, in view of Gupta, and in further view of Kawasaki, and the following statements are presented to clearly elucidate the distinguishing technical features between the claims and the cited prior arts. More specifically, applicant contends that in addition to the physical difference discussed above, the limitations of claims 1 and 10 differ from the cited prior arts with the following technical features:

*(1) communicating with an Internet Content Provider (ICP) by logging in Internet networks through a computer;*

*(2) authenticating comprises obtaining an authentication file from the user-login-identification means via the interface module, transmitting the authentication file to the administration/drive module, decrypting the authentication file by the administration/drive module, and accessing the user-login-identification means by the*

*ICP;*

With respect to the distinguishing technical feature (1), firstly, the single sign-on module of Ferchichi is not equivalent to the ICP in claims 1 and 10 of the present application, because ICP is a telecom operator providing users with Internet information service and internet service, such as Yahoo or Sohu, and users communicate with the ICP by logging in the Internet networks by a computer. In other words, users access the ICP **through Internet networks**. However, in Ferchichi (page 6, lines 6-8), the single sign-on module is a software module running on a microprocessor in a mobile equipment **instead of logging in Internet networks**. Secondly, the user equipment is not equal to the **Internet networks** in claims 1 and 10 of the present application because **the Internet networks are on the network side** and provided for all the users, but the user equipment is on the terminal side and is only provided to the mobile equipment user.

With respect to the distinguishing technical feature (2), “the server” in Gupta (paragraph 35) is not identical to “the administration/drive module” in claims 1 and 10 of the present application, because in claims 1 and 10 of the present application, the administration/drive module is provided in the login web page by the ICP, but in Gupta, the server is only a device providing service for all the mobile equipments. “Cookie is stored on the subscriber and can later be read back by the server” in Gupta is not equivalent to “obtaining an authentication file from the user-login-identification means via the interface module, transmitting the authentication file to the administration/drive module” in claims 1 and 10 of the present application, because the **source, transmission and destination** of the authentication file are all different. In claims 1 and 10 of the

present application, the interface module obtains the authentication file from the user-login-identification means (source), and the authentication file is transmitted to the administration/drive module (destination) via the interface module (transmission). In Gupta, Cookie is read back by the server (destination) from the subscriber (source) via the network (transmission).

Claim 4 is allowable at least based on the allowability of claim 1. In addition, applicant further respectfully contends that claim 4 by itself also recites allowable technical features neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited prior arts as follows:

*“accessing the user-login-identification means comprises: reading the information stored in the user-login-identification means by the ICP, if login identification information is obtained, returning the login identification information to the web page and determining whether a login-submit or an automatic submit & login should be performed according to user’s setup by the interface module; and if the login identification information is not obtained, informing the web page that the login identification information is not available and storing generated login identification information in the user-login-identification means by the interface module.”*

With respect to above distinguishing technical feature, “authenticating a user” in Gupta (paragraphs 73 and 77) is not equal to “accessing the user-login-identification means” of the present application because the judging objects are different and the treatment after the judgment is also different. In the present application, whether the login identification information is obtained or not is judged, but in Gupta, whether the information input by the user is the same as stored information. In the present

application, if login identification information is obtained, the interface module returns the login identification information to the web page and determines whether a login-submit or an automatic submit & login should be performed **according to user's setup** by the interface module; and **if the login identification information is not obtained, the interface module informs the web page that the login identification information is not available and stores the generated login identification information in the user-login-identification means.** In contrast, in Gupta, if the information input by the user is the same as stored information, a session is set up, **otherwise, it attempts to authenticate once again.**

Claim 19 is allowable at least based on the allowability of Claim 1. The applicant further respectfully contends that claim 19 by itself also recites allowable technical features neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited prior arts as follows:

*“communicating with two or more ICPs by logging in Internet networks through the computer.”*

With respect to above distinguishing technical feature, users may communicate with different ICPs in claim 19. However, in Ferchichi, there is only one single sign-on module. This technical feature is also not disclosed by Gupta and Kawasaki. The same reasoning also applies to claim 20.

From the foregoing discussion, it is clear that the instant invention differs from the cited prior arts. The above distinguishing technical features are recited in claims 1, 4, 10, 19 and 20 of the present application, and are not disclosed by Ferchichi, Gupta and Kawasaki. Therefore, claims 1, 4, 10, 19 and 20 should be allowable. Claims 2, 3, and 5-

9 are dependent claims of claim 1, and claims 11-18 are dependent claims of claim 10. By virtue of dependency to the allowable claims, claims 2-3, 5-9 and 11-18 should all be allowable. Prompt and favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jason Z. Lin/

Jason Z. Lin  
Agent for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 37,492  
Customer No. 33,804